## RESOLUTION *RE.* REDUCTION IN THE NUMBER OF TODDY AND ARRACK SHOPS IN THE STATE.

MR. P. PARAMESVARAN: സ്പീക്കർ സാർ, കഴിഞ്ഞവ്യാഴാഴ്ചയും ഇന്നലെയും എന്റെ മാന്യസ്നേഹിതൻ ശ്രീമാൻ മാധവവാര്യരും മറ്റു മാന്യസോദരന്മാരും മദ്ധ്യവർജ്ജനവിഷയത്തിൽ ഗവർൺമെന്റു ചെയ്യേണ്ടതായ പ്രവൃത്തികളെപ്പറ്റി വളരെ പ്രധാനമായ പ്രസംഗങ്ങൾ ചെയ്തു. അവരുടെ വാദത്തിന്റെ സാരം അംഗീകരണീയം തന്നെന്നു ഗവർൺമെന്റിനു ബോദ്ധ്യംവന്നു. ഏതുവിധം റെസല്യൂഷൻ ഉപക്ഷേപിക്കണം എന്നു് ഞാൻ അറിയിപ്പുകൊടുത്തിട്ടുണ്ടോ ആ റെസല്യൂഷന്റെ തത്വത്തിൻപടി തീർച്ചചെയ്യാം എന്നു് ഗവർൺമെന്റ് ഇന്നലെ ഉറപ്പു പറഞ്ഞുവല്ലൊ. അതിലേക്കായി ഗവർൺമെന്റിനോടു ഞാൻ നന്ദി അറിയിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു. ഈ സ്ഥിതിക്കു് എന്റെ റെസല്യൂഷനെ പ്രയോഗിക്കണം എന്നു ഞാൻ നിർബ്ബന്ധിക്കുന്നില്ല.

The following resolution was therefore not moved by Mr. Paramesvaran.

"That this Council recommends that the Government do arrange for the gradual reduction of toddy and arrack shops in the State, say, to the extent of 5 per cent., in order to reduce the facilities for drink and to promote the habit of temperance among the subjects of His Highness the Maha Raja."

The following two resolutions standing in the names of Mr. M. R. Madhava Variar and Mr. C. P. Kochukunju Pillai, respectively, were also not moved:

## RESOLUTION *RE.* DISCONTINUANCE OF THE PLEADERSHIP CLASS.

"That this Council recommends to the Government that the Pleadership Examination be suspended for a period of ten years or that only graduates be admitted to the Pleadership class."

## RESOLUTION *RE.* COMMENCEMENT OF RE-SETTLEMENT OPERATIONS.

"That this Council recommends to the Government that the contemplated re-settlement be not commenced in contravention of the principles enunciated in the Royal Proclamation of 1061 on the subject"

## RESOLUTION *RE.* SEPARATION OF THE OFFICES OF THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY AND THE ACCOUNT OFFICER.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Sir, I beg to move the following resolution:

"That this Council recommends that the offices of the Chief Account Officer and Financial Secretary to Government be not combined in one and the same person"

The need for the separation of the office of the Financial Secretary from that of the Account Officer has been urged at more than one session of the S. M. P. Assembly by several members, prominent among whom

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. G. Parameswaran Pillai.]

may be mentioned Messrs. A. Govinda Menon, T. K. Velu Pillai and T. Kumara Pillai. There is a popular feeling that the combination of the two offices in one and the same person is not only not an ideal arrangement, but that it has in a variety of ways tended to impair efficiency in the Finance Department. That this belief is sound has been confirmed by the information that Mr. Gordon in his first audit notes on the accounts of Travancore urged the desirability of separating the two appointments. I wish Mr. George would correct me if my information is wrong. Government then apparently found themselves unable to accept the above view. But even the Government, I daresay, will concede that the present is not an ideal or even a logical arrangement.

Since we have to go through a heavy programme to-day, I shall only summarise my arguments for the separation. Firstly, the expansion of the Legislative Council has rendered inevitable certain changes in the constitution of the Government and in the arrangements in the Secretariat to cope with the increasing volume of work and to deal satisfactorily with the new situation that has arisen. Finance is the most important of the departments of the State and a proper control of its activities would be an effective check of the vagaries in all departments. It was on this principle, I presume, that the House yesterday accepted the position of Government that a standing committee on finance alone would suffice for the present. Next to legislation, finance, chiefly in the shape of the annual budget, will engage the best part of the attention of this Council. It is essential that, when questions of finance are discussed here, and they come up in connection with every topic, we should have somebody who can speak on behalf of Government, somebody who will be in a position to expound the policy of Government, somebody on whom can be fastened the responsibility for safeguarding the financial interests of the State.

Secondly, the Account Officer is the Chief Account and Audit Officer. His primary duty is to render and certify to the accuracy of what is known as the appropriation account. It is for him to see that all expenditure is properly authorised and brought to account under its appropriate sub-head and that no financial irregularity is committed in his department and to see that the financial and account rules are obeyed. It would then be anomalous to invest the officer who is to scrutinise the application of a principle in each individual case with the power of laying down the principle.

Thirdly, it is the function of the Financial Secretary to regulate the public income and expenditure, to propose any change of taxation, to prepare financial forecasts and deal with general questions regarding audit, etc. The Financial Secretary should be the adviser to Government in matters relating to finance. The budgets now placed before us do not look like those prepared by a financier, but resemble more those prepared by an Account Officer who cannot see anything beyond the transactions of the previous year and do not provide for anything more than the routine requirements of the coming year. It is lamentable that they

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

betray no indications of any general financial policy. It is only the Financial Secretary, divested of his detailed audit of bills and expenditure, that can review the financial resources of the State, classify the stable and unstable sources of revenue, and the proportion of recurring items of expenditure out of the stable sources of income, adumbrate proposals for readjustment or improvement of the existing scheme of taxation on a sounder and more equitable basis, scrutinise public expenditure with a view to retrenchment, draw up a financial forecast for a fairly long term, elaborate proposals for reproductive works undertaken by the raising of loans, regulate the share of each department, revenue-yielding or not, in the total income of the State and otherwise deal with financial as distinct from purely account matters. The Account Officer should, under my proposal, correspond roughly to the Comptroller and Auditor-General elsewhere. This is a land of special cases and one fruitful cause of this is to my mind that the Judge is him-self the legislator and the Financial Secretary may even be made to correspond to the member for finance in other countries.

The separation has been effected in various Provinces in British India, in Mysore and in Hyderabad. In Mysore it is significant that, although the Retrenchment Committee recommended an amalgamation owing to sheer paucity of funds, Government have decided to keep the two offices separate to serve the best interests of the State finance.

The Account Officer here is apparently overburdened with a lot of routine work and has to be immersed in details. The financial statistics of Travancore have not been properly compiled. We have no consolidated statement showing our stable and unstable revenues. As a matter of fact, Mr. George was of opinion, on a prior occasion, that the distinction was not after all very marked in our case,although the fact seems to be otherwise. Again we do not know how much of our outside investments is Sirkar money or is composed of savings bank and other deposits from the people. The savings bank deposits have not been invested on reproductive works and are being perhaps utilised for cash balance purposes as well. We do not know how and wherefrom the 4 per cent interest on savings bank deposits is being paid and how this affects our total assets and liabilities.

The reply elicited by Mr. Padmanabha Pillai yesterday by a supplementary question to his interpellation regarding the Shencottah-Quilon Railway and other loans will be an eye-opener as to the ignorance of the Account Officer or of the Financial Secretary or of the Government—for we do not know in what capacity he gave the reply in regard to the finances of the State—and it left in the minds of the members an uncanny feeling that there was nobody responsible for the proper utilisation of the reserves, for the proper investment of the sinking or other funds, for taking advantage of opportune moments for clearing debts, etc. It was a sad thing to hear Mr. George confessing that he had no means of knowing the quotations of the Travancore Railway Loans issued in England.

MR. K. GEORGE: I beg to correct Mr. Parameswaran Pillai. They are not Travancore Loans, but they are loans raised by the S.I.R.Company.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. N. Padmanabha Pillai.]

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: or even of the local debenture loans. I am not certainly blaming him, for we cannot expect more or anything different, as he is primarily the Account Officer and only an *ex-officio* Financial Secretary.

The separation can be effected, it appears to me, without any material increase in expenditure. It will be interesting to remember that Mr. George has under him a number of Assistant Officers, as numerous as the Secretaries, and an establishment as strong as in the Dewan's office. When the Account Officer is divested of his duties of Financial Secretary, it will be possible to reduce one or two of the Assistant Officers. It will also be possible to fix the pay of the Account Officer after the separation lower than that of the present Account Officer.

If there is an apprehension that the Financial Secretary's duties will not engage the attention of a full-time officer, there is nothing to prevent in logically transferring to his control such matters as stamps and coinage, in respect of which he moved demands for grants. With a vigilant Finance Committee Government might rest assured that the Financial Secretary would have his hands full.

The cost of the separation would after all be not much, for, as I said, a reduction is possible in the number of Assistant Account Officers and in the pay of the Account Officer, and this should not deter Government from undertaking a piece of reform which has been repeatedly urged and which would be widely welcomed as an ideal system. Having regard to the advantages that we stand to gain by this separation, the additional expenditure is insignificant. My proposal is not to create a new office and it can be given effect to by a re-allocation of functions between the existing hands.

MR. N. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Sir, I rise to support the resolution that has been so ably moved by my friend, Mr. G. Parameswaran Pillai. I am also inclined to think that the functions of the Account and Audit Officer and of the Financial Secretary to Government are quite different. One is a matter of routine and the other a matter of policy. I should think that the combination of these two functions in one officer should prejudice both. Various illustrations can be cited to support this position. I am not going to discuss the matter in detail. But I wish to refer here to one point, *viz.*, the point raised by the answer given by the Financial Secretary yesterday to my question. Now, it is known to the House that we have a liability to the extent of Rs. 119 lakhs on account of the Quilon-Shencottah Railway. It is also seen that this liability represents loans raised in England. My question contained a suggestion that in September 1919 there was a splendid opportunity for this Government to wipe off the whole debt of Rs. 119 lakhs and the Government ought to have availed themselves of that opportunity to redeem the debt with about Rs. 40 lakhs. The opportunity presented itself in this way. The value of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

security then fell to £ 79 in the English markets and the exchange rate at that time was also in our favour. The Financial Secretary told us in answer that the Government had no information about the fall in the value of this security. I submit that that ought not to be the answer that ought to come from the Financial Secretary to Government in a matter of this kind. In answer to Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai's remarks on the point, the Financial Secretary explained that this loan is not a Travancore loan, but it is a loan raised by the South Indian Railway Company. To my mind, it makes no difference whether the loan is raised by the South Indian Railway Company or by anybody else. The liability to pay back the amount rests with the Travancore Government and as such I should think that the Financial Department and the Government should always be in touch with the matter and watch the movements of the price of the security in the British market.

PRESIDENT: May I ask you whether you are aware of the terms of the agreement between the Travancore Government and the Secretary of State in this matter?

MR. N. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Though under the agreement we may not be in a position to discharge the whole debt at our pleasure, this State could, as a private individual, very well have purchased the security when the prices fell in the English market. My point is that there was an opportunity in 1919 when this State could have redeemed this debt at a very very small cost and that it was the duty of the Government to have watched the opportunity and availed themselves of it. There is yet another point that the House has to consider in this connection. The interest that was guaranteed when the loan was started was only 3½ per cent. The Financial Secretary himself admitted that subsequently the interest rose to 6½ per cent and that the refloating or the reissuing of the loan at the enhanced rate of interest had not the consent of this State. This is a matter that ought to receive serious notice. I have absolutely no quarrel with the Financial Secretary or the present Government, because I know these things took place a long time ago. The point is that it is the combination of several functions in the Financial Secretary that prevents him from devoting particular attention to such affairs. So I whole-heartedly support the proposition that has been brought forward by my friend, Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON: Sir, I beg to state that I fully endorse the view of my friend, Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai, and that it reflects no discredit whatever on the officer who is at present in charge of our finances.

Of course, as Audit Officer, he has certain definite duties and as Financial Secretary other equally definite duties to perform. But these duties are quite different and, as a result, there is now absolutely no financial policy worth the name for this State. That is why we urge that these functions should be separated.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. George.]

It may be asked whether under the present extreme financial stringency, it is advisable to add another highly paid official to the Secretariat. I say that it is worth while spending ten or twelve thousand rupees a year in separating the office of the Audit Officer from that of the Financial Secretary, because the full attention of the Financial Secretary will then be devoted to questions like those discussed by Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai, and the State will be a gainer by such a separation of these functions.

PRESIDENT: We may now rise for lunch. After the business of the day is over, the non-official members of the House will elect three members under the presidentship of the Deputy President to sit on the proposed Standing Finance Committee.

The Council rose for lunch at 2-15. P. M.

---

The Council reassembled after lunch at 2-47 P. M.

MR. K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Before proceeding further, shall we have the benefit of the views of the Government on the matter?

PRESIDENT: Yes. Mr. George, will you speak?

MR. K. GEORGE: Sir, I am in a somewhat delicate position, having to speak against a resolution which concerns me personally, and about which some misconception might arise, that my views in this matter are coloured by personal considerations. I would, however, assure the House that, in discussing this question, I do so only on its merits, and personally I shall be indifferent as to the outcome of this resolution.

Sir, Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai in moving this resolution referred to the fact that, on more than one occasion, the question was moved in the Sri Mulam Popular Assembly. He also referred to the fact of the existence of a popular feeling in the country that the two offices should be separate. Sir, I ask the House this question—

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Not exactly that the popular feeling was to separate the two offices, but that the combination might impair the efficiency of the administration.

MR. K. GEORGE: Even if that be the case, I ask the House whether we are to be guided by popular feeling in this matter. Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai referred to the recent order of the Mysore Government in regard to this question. Well, I have got the special Finance Committee's report here. It is, Sir, a curious feature, I should say, that in Mysore the popular feeling was that the two offices should be recombined. In Mysore the appointments were once combined in one and the same officer. Subsequently they separated it, and it is said in the Special Finance Committee's report that many of the non-official witnesses that gave evidence before the committee suggested the combination of the offices of the Financial Secretary and the Comptroller.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

The Government ordered otherwise, because they said that the condition of the finances of the State was critical. What I mean is this. We are not to judge these questions by popular feeling. Such feeling may be right or wrong. We are to look at the question dispassionately on its own merits. These are days of financial stress, and the Council is quite aware of the fact. So when the House resolves to upset an arrangement which conduces to economy, there must be some solid and substantial reasons for the same. I listened very carefully to what Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai said, but I am not convinced that he has adduced any substantial reasons for setting aside the present arrangement which, he says, is not working properly. He first referred to the opinion of Mr. Gordon. I may tell the House that in the year 1918, at the second inspection by Mr. Gordon of the Audit Office, he was confidentially asked by the Government whether there was any disadvantage in keeping the two appointments combined and he reported that it was desirable that the Finance department should be given more work, and that if the Finance department was given more work it might be perhaps difficult for one man to do both the Audit Office work and the Finance Department work. At the same time he said that it was of absolutely no use to separate the two appointments, if Government did not give wide and fairly independent powers to the Financial Secretary.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Will the Finance Member be pleased to place that report on the table?

MR. K. GEORGE: I am sorry I am not in a position to do so. He said that there was no use in entrusting the work to a separate Secretary if the Government would not act in accordance with his opinion. That question was carefully considered by Government during the administration of the late Dewan Mr. M. Krishnan Nair. He said that the constitution of the State was such that it would be impracticable to invest any Secretary with powers independent of the Head of the Administration and so it was ordered at the time that the question might be dropped. That is all about Mr. Gordon's report. Now Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai said that the budget that was prepared savoured rather of an Account Officer's report than one framed by a Financial Secretary. Sir, I fail to see the distinction. Whether as Account Officer or as Financial Secretary he acts only as the mouthpiece of Government and he cannot enunciate any policy because he is the Financial Secretary. Thus the question of policy cannot enter into the question of separation at all, because whether separated or not it is not the Financial Secretary that dictates the policy of the State. It is the Head of the Administration that has to do it, and that he can do whether the Account Officer and the Financial Secretary are one person or not. The question of separation has nothing to do with it. Even without separation, at present, financial questions are referred to the Financial Secretary, and his opinions are taken, but the decisions rest with the Government.



LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. George.]

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: May I ask the Financial Secretary whether all questions affecting the finances of the State are invariably referred to the Financial Secretary?

MR. K. GEORGE: Exceptions are few. Such questions are generally referred to the Financial Secretary, so that I do not see exactly how the separation is going to enable the Financial Secretary to lay down policy or to tell this House what the policy of the Government will be. Even now the Financial Secretary can state his opinion when the Government refers financial questions to him. In any way separation is not going to increase the powers of the Financial Secretary and enable him to say what the policy of the Government is. Sir, the whole question is whether the work of the Finance Department is now being well done. Well, for the House to arrive at a correct understanding of the question, it has not yet had sufficient opportunity. The only occasion at which the Financial Secretary came before the House with purely financial matters was when the last budget was presented. What I gathered then was that, except for the omission of financial policy in my speech, which, as I have already stated, is not possible for a Financial Secretary to enunciate, the budget gave satisfaction to the House. In the speech with which I presented the budget, I gave a review of the past 10 years. So it was not merely the review of the past one or two years as stated by Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai, and in the matter of a financial forecast it is after all open to the present combined officer to prepare such a forecast. The proper authority at present, to say whether the Finance Department is doing its work well or ill is, I think, the Government under whom the Financial Secretary is working and the Government are not likely to continue an arrangement if it is unsatisfactory. I have got here the Account Code of the Mysore State where at present, as the members know, the Financial Secretary is a different person from the Account Officer. There the duties of the Financial Secretary are laid down. If the House has no objection I will read the portions dealing with it.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: We want it.

MR. K. GEORGE:

"All descriptions of work falling under the heads below will be dealt with in the Financial Secretariat.

(i) General Finance and Accounts—
- (a) Annual finance programme.
- (b) Budget estimates of the State.
- (c) Expenditure of the State.
- (d) Pensions and gratuities.
- (e) General questions regarding pay and salaries.
- (f) Accounts and classification therein.
- (g) Administration of the Account Department and technical work connected with treasuries.
- (h) Interpretation of Mysore Service Regulations and other financial codes and rules.
- (i) Special concessions involving relaxation of financial rules.
- (j) Ways and means.
- (k) Loans and investments, excluding loans granted under authorised rules for agricultural and industrial purposes.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(*l*) Advances for the purchase of motor cars and motor bicycles and for house building.
(*m*) General questions regarding audit.
(*n*) List of approved firms dealing with Government.
(*o*) General questions concerning local finance and borrowing by local bodies.

(ii) Banking (including savings banks, State life insurance, general provident fund, Mysore bank, but not co-operative societies and agricultural banks)."

It goes on to say that--

"In the following classes of cases reference should be made to the Financial Secretariat by other Secretariats before the issue of orders:—

(i) Proposals involving a permanent increase of expenditure including revision of salaries and establishments.

(ii) Proposals involving expenditure of a non-recurring nature which has not been provided for in the budget, or which, even if provided for, has not been specifically sanctioned by Government after reference to the Financial Secretariat."

These are the items of work which now fall to the separate Financial Secretary in the Mysore State and I may assure the House that, except for one or two items that do not obtain here—for instance, the list of approved firms and the General Provident Fund—the Financial Secretary here does all this work at present. In fact he does more. He has the control of the mint and the currency, and he is in charge of the Stamp Department. As regards referring proposals involving permanent increase of expenditure, etc., such questions are almost always referred by the Government to the Financial Secretary. In very exceptional cases this may not be done. The House will thus see that, even without separation, the whole work that is now done by the Finance Department in Mysore is done here also. So there is no need to split the two offices.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR: May I know, Sir, what the additional expenditure due to the proposed separation of the two offices will be?

MR. K. GEORGE: I have not worked it out. So, I cannot say exactly.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR: In a general way.

MR. K. GEORGE: It may involve a large sum.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF: May I know whether Mr. George finds it difficult to carry on the work now?

MR. K. GEORGE: If I had felt any difficulty, I would have personally represented the matter to the Government.

Sir, the separation need be made only if the work is badly done or if the present Financial Secretary finds it difficult to carry on his work. As regards the work not being fully done, we have been doing almost all the work now done in the Finance Department in British India and Mysore. As regards my ability to carry on, I admit that there is heavy work especially during the budget session and other sessions of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. George.]

this Council and perhaps the work will be much heavier when we have the Standing Finance Committee.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF: Is the work normally heavy?

MR. K. GEORGE: I may say that I am now able to carry on the work; and so the present proposal is a matter of unnecessary additional expenditure, especially in view of the present financial strain. Mr. G. Paramesvarn Pillai, in speaking about the feasibility of separation and the cost of it, has said that the Account Officer has now a large number of Assistant Account Officers and a large staff of clerks and that he can very well afford to surrender some Assistant Account Officers and a large number of clerks. It is true that there are 5 Assistant Account Officers in the Account Office. None of them, however, assists me in financial secretariat work. They are all in charge of separate sections in the Account Office. Except in the matter of mere routine work such as the initialling of certain registers and the signing of routine letters, no Assistant Account Officer assists the Financial Secretary. All the Assistant Account Officers have their own specific work and none of them is able to say that he is being underworked. One officer is exclusively employed for inspecting work outside the town, and another in the town. There is heavy inspecting work to be done. Now that the Devaswom Department has been separated—and there are 139 major Devasoms in the State which have to be individually attended to—it may even be necessary to strengthen the existing staff of the office; for the present staff has already a heavy programme of work. As regards the clerical staff also, if some of my friends here would visit my office on any day in an evening, I can show them how they are working. They are working with lights almost every day in the month. So there is no reduction at all possible in the staff of the Account Office.

Then Mr. Padmanabha Pillai referred again to the question of the English loans. I will clear the misunderstanding on this subject. We did actually correspond with the Home Board of the South Indian Railway Company and we actually found that we could not go in and purchase or extinguish these loans. They were not issued by the Travancore Darbar.

MR. N. PADMANABHA PILLAI: May I know why the State, as a private individual, did not purchase the security bonds, when they were available?

MR. K. GEORGE: That question was also considered by the Finance Department. It was said by the railway authorities that the bonds were bearer bonds and nobody knew in whose hands they were, that when the bonds fell due they were generally offered for renewal by advertisement and that generally the holders of these bonds had them renewed. They did not sell them. "The Travancore Government may invest money in equally good securities in India." This was what they said, because it was impossible to purchase them. We dropped the matter,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

My point is that that question was not left without consideration as stated by my friend, Mr. Padmanabha Pillai.

PRESIDENT: There is also this point. The money we could apply for the purpose was held in the shape of Government of India securities and we could realise only less than half the face value of these securities. We had no spare cash to invest. I do not know if that appears in the correspondence. I only mention another reason to show that the matter was not quite so simple.

MR. K. GEORGE: Not only that, Sir, our sinking fund then amounted to much less than what it is now. At the same time we enquired and found out that we could not profitably go in for these bonds.

MR. J. JOHN NIDIRY: Was any broker tried?

MR. K. GEORGE: No. We did not try that. Sir, I have now explained the portion sufficiently well. There is nothing at present necessitating the separation of the two departments, because all the work generally required to be done by the Fniancial Secretary is done by the Financial Secretary here, even though he is also the Account Officer. Even if there be a separate officer, he can do only what he does now. He may give his opinion. Government are not certainly bound to carry out all his recommendations, and in these circumstances I hope that my friend, Mr. Parameasvaran Pillai, will find his way to withdraw his resolution.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR: After listening to the very elaborate—

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Sir, I do not think that any useful purpose will be served by continuing the discussion. Now that the Financial Secretary and Account Officer has very categorically assured us that he can very well carry on the work of both the Financial Secretary and the Account Officer to his best abilities, and as he has requested us to wait for some time more before moving this question, I have absolutely no objection to wait for some time more. Before withdrawing my resolution, I might say that the reasons given by him are not sufficiently convincing.

PRESIDENT: Strictly speaking, a member withdrawing a resolution cannot make any observations on the merits of it. You must either withdraw or press the resolution.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I withdraw the resolution.

The resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

## RESOLUTION *RE* TRAINING OF UNDERGRADUATE TEACHERS.

PRESIDENT: The next resolution stands in the name of Mr. C. P. Kochukunju Pillai and runs as follows:

"That this Council recommends to the Government that the period of training for undergraduate teachers in the Education Department be reduced to one year."

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly